

Americans for Democratic Action immediately after World War II under the leadership of Eleanor Roosevelt and John Kenneth Galbraith and Walter Reuther and others was a very important organization in which liberals fought a two-front ideologic war against conservatives who wanted to retreat from the New Deal on the one side and from Communists who were anti-democratic on the other.

As time went on, the Americans for Democratic Action, ADA as it is known, became less important, probably because the Democratic Party, I believe, moved more in that direction. But it was still important to have that organization then as it is now as an independent force, and Leon Shull kept that organization vibrant.

There is an expression used about boxers who are fighting in a weight class heavier than their own, that they are able to punch above their weight, that they have a strength and a physical ability that allows them to be competitive with people bigger and theoretically beyond their reach.

Leon Shull punched above his weight, and ADA under him punched above its weight. He was in this city for many years a beacon for those of us who believed that the liberal tenets of Franklin Roosevelt were still very relevant, that a wealthy society in the United States had both the obligation and the resources to diminish inequality, not to dispose of it altogether in a capitalistic system, but to diminish it.

Leon Shull was an ally of people fighting racism, of people fighting poverty, of people fighting unjust wars, of people fighting for rational environmental policy, of people fighting for free speech and fairness. And with all that, he was a gentle man. He was a fierce advocate of these policies, but in personal demeanor a man of gentleness, a man who inspired the love and affection of those who worked with him. In later years he retired and he moved away from Washington, and I saw much less of him.

Mr. Speaker, when I read of his death, I realized as I thought about it all that he is one of the people from whom I learned a great deal. To his wife, Anne, to his daughters and others who have lost this great man, I send my deepest sympathy; and to his memory I express my gratitude for being the model of an effective liberal.

ILLUSORY PROGRESS IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WYNN. Good evening, Mr. Speaker. Last Friday, I had the unfortunate occasion to attend the funeral of Sergeant Princess Samuels, age 22, a graduate of Flowers High School in my district and one of the most recent casualties of our misadventure in Iraq.

I rise today to comment on what I consider to be a failed policy in Iraq,

because she is only one of over 3,700 American soldiers who have been killed in Iraq. Meanwhile, 27,000 U.S. troops have been wounded in action, 12,000 of whom will not be able to return to action, and although we don't comment on it often, at least 50,000 Iraqis have been killed; 18,000 Iraqi civilians were killed in August alone.

It was very sad to be with the family of Sergeant Princess Samuels. Her mother, in an understandable note of bitterness, said that here she found herself prepared for a funeral while the Commander in Chief was preparing for a wedding for his daughter. Her anger was certainly understandable, and our sympathies and those of all us in the Fourth Congressional District go out to Ms. Samuels.

So I find it very unfortunate that we begin to hear comments such as "the surge is working" and that we need to "stay the course." This is the wrong course. This is the wrong course. We need to stay engaged, but we need to move away from this military course.

Our troops have fought valiantly and they have done everything we have asked of them. They have done more. But, right now, the GAO report tells us that the strategy is flawed. You see, the strategy was to have a surge that would allow this government some breathing room, and in that breathing room they would have a reconciliation and begin to bring the various sectarian groups in Iraq together.

What we found from the GAO report is that that hasn't happened. The surge has only provided the illusion of progress. That is, if you put more troops in, you will reduce the casualties among those troops. But the fact is, the overall level of violence continues to be very high. The number of Iraqis killed remains about the same.

Now, last January the President laid out some benchmarks. He said that these ought to be completed, and this is why we are having the surge. The GAO report says only three of the 18 benchmarks have been met. Do the math: that means 15 have not been met.

These are not benchmarks that U.S. troops, no matter how valiant, can achieve. These are political benchmarks that this Iraqi Government has failed to achieve. The number of daily attacks over the last 6 months is about the same. In fact, the number of Iraqi army units capable of independent operation has actually decreased. And what we find is insurgents frequently work with the Iraqi police and military forces based on common sectarian ties.

There is an interesting article in The Washington Post today. Our U.S. troops are pinned down in a section of west Baghdad and they are calling for relief from Iraqi troops. The relief did not come. Why? Because the Iraqi troops were in league with the Shiite militia in that area and they did not respond. Fortunately, our American troops were able to reach cover and survive, but the story illustrates an-

other failure that is occurring in Iraq as the so-called security forces that we are trying to prop up were in fact working with our enemies. The policy is not working.

We can't continue this policy. We need a new direction. We need to look to diplomacy as a way to resolve this problem. People say, well, if we withdraw U.S. troops, there is going to be a blood bath. There is a bloodbath now.

The fact of the matter is if U.S. troops withdraw, one of the major catalysts for violence will be removed from the situation. We will then be in a position to support diplomatic efforts, peace initiatives by Muslim countries, by the U.N., by internationally recognized military leaders. Sometimes this country has an arrogance and believes that we are the only ones that can promote peace. I disagree. I believe that other countries, Muslim countries, other people can also promote peace. And I also believe that they want peace, and given supportive conditions, they can in fact create peace.

I think we have to accept the fact that the surge gives an illusion of success, but the overall policy has not worked, because the GAO reported the benchmarks haven't been met, and it is time to move in a new direction. I also noted today the British, our allies in this adventure, have already begun to leave Basra, leaving the cities in the hands of the Iraqi security.

The point is, everyone but this administration realizes we need a new direction. I hope the administration will look at the GAO report and conclude, as it has, that this policy is a failure and that we need a new policy in Iraq.

ENDING THE MADNESS IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, there will be a great debate in Congress in the coming days about the administration's escalation strategy in Iraq. The administration has been trying during this time to influence that debate by launching a saturation public relations campaign designed to convince us that the escalation is working. Before the debate in Congress begins, however, it is really important for every Member of this House to know the facts; and the truth is the escalation is not working. It is failing. Here are the facts:

First, this summer has been the bloodiest summer of the occupation for American troops since the occupation began. Between June and August, 261 of our brave troops died. Over the same three months last year, 169 died. That is too many, absolutely; but it is a 54 percent increase this year over last year.

Second, the escalation has been deadly for U.S. troops ever since it began: 654 U.S. troops were killed between February, when the escalation began,

and this August. That is 63 percent more than over the same period last year.

Third, the escalation has been a disaster for the Iraqi people. Over 5,000 more Iraqi civilians were killed between the start of the escalation in February and this August than died over the same period last year; and according to news reports, the number of internally displaced Iraqis has more than doubled since the escalation began, from 500,000 to 1.1 million refugees.

Next, despite the administration's claims of progress on security, the Government Accountability Office has reported that average daily attacks against civilians have remained unchanged, unchanged, since the escalation began and that the Iraqi Government has failed to meet most of its key benchmarks for military and political progress. A National Intelligence Estimate describes the Iraqi leaders as unable to govern effectively and that the Iraqi Government's ability to bring about political reconciliation is likely to become even more precarious.

Fifth, and finally, the statement on Monday that the administration might, might, might, that "might" is the operative word, might consider bringing a few troops home, I believe that was a brazen political maneuver designed to give Members of Congress who are needing a reason to stay the course a way out.

Mr. Speaker, it is outrageous that the administration is playing politics with the lives of our troops and with the emotions of their families. But their real goal couldn't be clearer: General Petraeus told a congressional delegation that went to Iraq in August that American troops will have to be in Iraq for 9 or 10 more years. I doubt that even the White House's most ardent supporters want the occupation to continue for another 10 years. Yet, incredibly, that could be the plan.

We can only come to one conclusion, which is that under the administration's leadership, there is no light at the end of this tunnel. There will be more deaths, more wounded, more refugees and more destruction, with absolutely no end in sight. Meanwhile, our standing in the world will continue to deteriorate. The terrorists will continue to hatch their plots against us in their safe havens far from Iraq, and the occupation will continue to rob our Treasury of the resources we desperately need for healthcare, for education, for infrastructure, for energy independence, for the environment and real homeland security.

The administration will never end the madness in Iraq. The American people have called upon Congress to do it, and history will judge each of us by how we answer that call.

□ 2015

ADDRESSING THE MURDERS OF WOMEN IN CIUDAD JUAREZ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. SOLIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to discuss recent efforts to address the ongoing murders of the women of Ciudad Juarez in Mexico, located just 5 minutes from our border near El Paso.

Over the past 14 years, well over 400 women, and I mean young women and girls, have been slaughtered, brutally murdered or raped in the city of Ciudad Juarez. I hold up this poster here tonight to show you the list of over 400 names of young women whose bodies have either not been found or identified, but we know have been missing, many who were those victims that were found slaughtered in the streets of Mexico. These are the names of young women who were taken from their families too soon. In fact, the profile of many of these young girls is within the age range of 15 to 20.

Slender with long black hair, olive skin, many working in the heart of Ciudad Juarez in what we call maquiladoras. Those are American-run corporations where many of these women were forced to work to help provide for their families.

The fact remains that many of these murders still remain unsolved. Many of these women were put on a track to work four different shifts. Given if you have a young woman or child working on a shift from 12 midnight to 8 in the morning, how was she transported there? Were there any security protections put in place to protect her? Was law enforcement aware and knowingly, maybe somehow acknowledged that these murders were taking place but did nothing?

That is why we are crying out today, along with the families of Ciudad Juarez and along with those families I represent in my own district. I was reminded that there are some relatives who were murdered. In fact, one young man whose cousin was missing went to Mexico to find out what happened. When he began inquiring about that particular case, the police there informed him that he should stay away and not ask questions and inquire about his cousin. Well, he didn't just leave it there. He kept insisting on finding out what the facts were and why this death was not given the full extent and force of the law. Evidently, at that point the police said, if you do not stay away, you will be the one that will end up in jail. And sure enough, that is what happened.

It is unfortunate that laws there are not given the same kind of credibility that we have here in the U.S. I cry out here with my friends and families because we are saying that the U.S.-Mexican Government has to do something.

After the recent election of President Calderon, he states that he is going to

do everything he can in his power to provide enforcement of laws that protect women against violence, yet we still have not seen enough done where we find the culprits who have been involved in these vicious murders over the last few years. Given he has just recently been elected and has spoken about bringing his office behind the enforcement of violence against women, he has even helped to try to enact legislation to do that, but every single state in Mexico has to adopt those provisions and those codes. What I am finding is that many of those states in Mexico are not following along that line.

I have to ask myself, when we can help women in Iraq and Afghanistan who have been murdered by the Taliban, why can we not ask for the same kind of respect and dignity from our partners in the south, from Mexico. I know this is not a partisan issue. Here in the House we were able to send a letter to President Calderon. In fact, 90 Members of the House signed onto the letter, and I thank the subcommittee Chair, Mr. ENGEL, of the Foreign Affairs Committee on this particular area, and also DAN BURTON, for being so gracious and helping to support this resolution passed by this House, H. Con. Res. 90, and also a letter that we recently sent to President Calderon.

I ask that the House speak up about this issue because this continues to go on. In fact, I was pleased we had a delegation go down 2 years ago to visit alongside the border and meet with the families and meet with public officials and ask why there was nothing being done to help expedite these cases. In fact, our government went as far as to even provide assistance through USAID to have forensic experts come in to help identify the cadavers of these young women. I believe there are 79, maybe more now, cadavers that have not been identified.

Families have contacted me and other Members of Congress asking for help on our side because we have the tools and instruments to do that. I know this country has the goodwill and can do some things, but I am also pleading to those parliamentarians and to the President of Mexico to do the same thing. While he is asking for us to help in immigration reform, which I am strongly supportive of, I also ask him to do what he can to help with law enforcement, with reform, and also to help expedite those cases that still have to be processed, and would ask that our Congress also support the continuance of oversight on this particular issue for the women and families of Ciudad Juarez.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)